

Andrew Sweeney

From: Wang, Jeffrey [jwang@fklaw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2007 10:36 AM
To: Andrew.Sweeney@bozlaw.com
Cc: john@bozlaw.com; adrienne.raps@bozlaw.com; Robert Carrillo
Subject: RE: GMA/Bop

Andrew:

Rule 68 requires filing. Because this is an e-filing case, it thus requires e-filing. In particular, here you have e-filed your earlier purported acceptance (which, for the reasons in my letter of last night, is invalid), so the amended acceptance must be filed in its place. Please advise as to whether you will file the revised acceptance in order to supersede the earlier, invalid acceptance.

Thank you.

-Jeff

From: Andrew Sweeney [mailto:Andrew.Sweeney@bozlaw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2007 10:25 AM
To: Wang, Jeffrey
Cc: john@bozlaw.com; adrienne.raps@bozlaw.com; 'Robert Carrillo'
Subject: RE: GMA/Bop

Jeff

Rule 68 does not require e-filing. The offer is now fully accepted and it is not necessary to file it. Since GMA is not seeking to obtain any relief outside the offer of judgment, is there any reason why you would want me to file today's acceptance?

ATS

From: Wang, Jeffrey [mailto:jwang@fklaw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2007 10:22 AM
To: Andrew.Sweeney@bozlaw.com
Cc: john@bozlaw.com; adrienne.raps@bozlaw.com; Robert Carrillo
Subject: RE: GMA/Bop

Andrew:

Since you have e-filed the earlier version, please e-file the amended acceptance as well.
Thank you.

-Jeff

From: Andrew Sweeney [mailto:Andrew.Sweeney@bozlaw.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Wang, Jeffrey
Cc: john@bozlaw.com; adrienne.raps@bozlaw.com; 'Robert Carrillo'
Subject: RE: GMA/Bop

Jeff,

Here is our acceptance of your offer of judgment. I apologize for the confusion.

The same has been mailed to you this morning.

Thank you

Andrew